



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/670,121	09/26/2000	Alain Bouilloux	33831F131	4873

7590 03/04/2003

Smith, Gambrell & Russell, LLP  
Beveridge, DeGrandi, Weilacher & Young  
Intellectual Property Group  
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

WOODWARD, ANA LUCRECIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1711

15

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. <i>mk</i>

EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	15

DATE MAILED:

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

### ADVISORY ACTION

☐ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- a) ☐ is extended to run \_\_\_\_\_ or continues to run \_\_\_\_\_ from the date of the final rejection
- b) ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).
- ☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 02/20/03 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☒ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- a. ☒ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
- b. ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
- c. ☒ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
- d. ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- e. ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: *In claim 16, the "%" is not consistent with the origin parts by weight" and as such, engenders a new 112 issue.*

*Amended Claims 1, 3-5, 12 and 13 would be withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected species.*

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. ☒ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be entered ☒ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: NONE

Claims objected to: NONE

Claims rejected: 1, 3-5, 12 and 13

However;

☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_

4. ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because *the examiner is unable to confirm that the comparison of present claim example and Reiman's example 22 is a direct comparison because*
5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented. *is unclear whether or not the nylons are the same*

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.
- ☐ Other *and ISO and DIN standards are comparable.*

*ANA WOODWARD*  
PRIMARY EXAMINER